

**Mr. Chairman:** I have given a ruling and I do not wish to deviate from that. We proceed to the next resolution.

RESOLUTION RE RIVER VALLEY  
SGHEMES

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri Jhulan Sinha

**The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathl):** May I submit that this will come within the provisions of rule 325?

**Mr. Chairman:** What is the point of objection?

**Shri Hathl:** The point is this. Rule 325 says that no member shall anticipate the discussion of any subject of which notice has been given provided that in determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by the speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.

We will have discussion when the Demands for Grants for the Irrigation Ministry are discussed. It is a question of policy. The other point is that in principle this has been accepted by the Planning Commission. It is substantially the same matter; a policy has been enunciated also and the policy has been accepted; substantially it is the same but that may not be very relevant to the point of order. Under the rule, "the matter is likely to be brought for discussion before the House within a reasonable time" is relevant here. Therefore, I think that the resolution is out of order.

**Mr. Chairman:** The rule runs as follows:

"No member shall anticipate the discussion of any subject of which notice has been given provided that in determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by the Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time."

It is quite true that so far as the Ministry of Irrigation and Power is concerned, the Demand will be coming, but so far, we do not know whether cut motions are going to be moved or not. How can we say that? We do not know whether a Member may move his cut motion or not. The Member may or may not move his cut motion and he may not choose to have a discussion at that time.

Secondly, I would like to know for certain, so far as this resolution is concerned, when the notice of this resolution was given and when the notice of the cut motion was given, because at the time when the notice was given, it could not be said that the matter would come under discussion during the Budget. After all, it may happen that the discussion of this motion under this particular Demand may not come off at all, as it happened in the case of so many cut motions under the other Demands. Some of them were moved and some were not moved. So it cannot be ascertained at this stage with any precision that the matter is sure to come before the House. I would, therefore, think that the Resolution may be moved and discussed now. Moreover there may be no cut motion in regard to the policy of priority in respect of quick results and cheaper cost.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** (Diamond Harbour): Is this Resolution the concern of the Minister of Irrigation and Power or the Minister of Planning, because the Resolution emphasises certain criteria of the schemes to be executed in the second Five Year Plan? It concerns planning, thereafter for the execution of the work the Ministry of Irrigation and Power comes into the picture.

**Mr. Chairman:** So far as this Resolution is concerned, the Government have not themselves pronounced any decision in the matter in the House. Yes, Shri Jhulan Sinha.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** What is the time allotted for this Resolution.

**Mr. Chairman:** Two hours.

**Shri Jhulan Sinha (Saran North):** I beg to move:

“This House is of opinion that in fixing priorities for the river valley schemes to be executed in the Second Five Year Plan preference should be given to those schemes which are capable of producing quick results at cheaper cost.”

The language of this Resolution is quite clear, but in order that any misunderstandings may not be created either in the minds of the Government or of others, I wish to say a few words by way of introduction. When I desired to move this resolution, I never intended to cast any aspersion upon the way in which the schemes had progressed during the first four years of the first Five Year Plan or how they are going to be executed in the second Five Year Plan. I only wanted to convey to the Government the impression that occurred to me as a result of the working of the Five Year Plan that is still going on.

I have gone through the Progress Report of the Five Year Plan especially in respect of the river valley projects—the latest report that has been given to us—and from the figures I find that the total expenditure on irrigation and power projects up to 31st March, 1954, comes to Rs. 440 crores. The total area benefited so far or is likely to be benefited in the near future is 2·8 million acres. The production of power up till now, as given in this progress report, is 4½ lakhs kilowatts. So, this is the total expenditure incurred so far and the benefit that has accrued to the country so far. My own impression is that the major river valley schemes were included in the first Five Year Plan because of certain extraneous considerations, considerations of State, considerations of previous commitments of certain high dignitaries of the Government and considerations other than those of sheer merits of the projects themselves. I beg to illustrate may point by referring to a particular scheme that has not so far been taken up in my State of Bihar. I do

not know what will be the fate of that scheme in the coming Plan. I may just refer to that scheme as one conceived in 1947 by no less a person than the then Food Minister in the Government of India and who now happens to be the President of the Union. I therefore need not mention his name. That scheme was fully investigated by an engineer deputed by the Government of India and a report was submitted to the Government of Bihar State and possibly to the Central Government also. I may just in passing refer to the merits of that scheme. The figures that I am quoting are embodied in the report submitted by the Government of Bihar to the Government of India. Merit No. 1 of the scheme is that the scheme is the cheapest of those so far undertaken in this country. I mean the Damodar Valley Scheme, the Hirakud Project, the Bhakra Nangal, etc. According to the calculations given in the report, the cost is Rs. 79-12-0 per acre as against Rs. 435 for the other big schemes that are being executed. The per kilowatt cost of Rs. 1,648 as against the current cost of Rs. 5,255 per kw. of the present schemes. The next merit of this scheme is that the revenue return from this scheme is highly satisfactory, being 7·75 per cent on the capital outlay. The third merit is that the additional foodgrains and non-cereals, especially jute and sugarcane, likely to be produced as a direct result of the execution of this scheme will pay up the entire capital outlay on the project in a year, the figure for additional foodgrains being 1·88 gross maunds valued at Rs. 22·55 crores and those for jute and sugarcane being Rs. 5·40 crores each year as against the total capital expenditure of Rs. 27·82 crores. The fourth merit is that the scheme will more than wipe out the entire deficit in food in Bihar and turn the State from a deficit into a surplus one, the additional produce being 1·87 crore maunds as against the total deficit in Bihar of 1·82 crore maunds in a normal year. The fifth merit of this scheme is that it is further likely to lead to the development of industries, increase in the railway and road



[Shri Jhulan Sinha]

traffic and to augment public finances by increase in sugar and sugarcane cess, agricultural income-tax and the like. Such are the merits of the scheme which was fully investigated by a competent engineer and a report submitted to the Government of Bihar and to the Government of India.

But then there was another difficulty. The Government of Bihar could not forward the scheme to the Government of India as they had to choose only one—either the Kosi or the Gandak. Naturally, Kosi scheme could tackle the problem of vast devastation in the area and the scheme that I referred to could only lead to the development of the area. The Government of Bihar had no option but to choose Kosi and they insisted upon the Kosi scheme. Now, that Kosi scheme is being executed.

The point that I was driving at was this: the merit of the scheme was put in the background because of certain considerations, that the State of Bihar had only one scheme to choose whereas the other States might have had many alternatives before them. The point is that the merits of this scheme that I have just pointed out are that it is the cheapest, the most easily executable and the most paying, according to me in the whole country, but it has been relegated to the background because proper attention was not paid to it. I have just quoted this instance to show that in the execution of schemes in the first Five Year Plan, the considerations that should have weighed with the Government have not really weighed.

This does not mean that I am against any of the schemes that are going on, nor am I trying to belittle the beneficent effects of any of them. What I mean to point out is that as the next Five Year Plan is in the making, Government should keep in mind the salient points of each scheme regardless of the fact that there is one scheme in a State or two such schemes in one State. The whole country is not only one, but is rightly regarded as

one. The work is going on for its development in one direction and with one intention in view. If that is the criterion that is actuating me, I would like the Government also to move along that line. The schemes that are to be taken up should be the ones that are capable of giving immediate results at cheaper rates. That is what I mean to say.

We have just heard during the debate this forenoon that the general state of country is such that for the time being we seem to have reached a point where we can meet out our own food requirements and we need not import from other countries. But this state of things is very delicate and it may any day recede back. We may again fall back on deficit days when the whole country will have again to go through the pangs and troubles that we had to face during the days of controls which have only just now ended.

I would, therefore, like the Government to keep in view the one idea of growing as much food at as cheap a rate and as quickly as possible, in the circumstances available. I do not mean, by this Resolution, to fetter the discretion of the Government in other respects and considerations. But, so far as the choosing of river valley schemes is concerned, I would like them to keep in view the cost of the scheme, the executability of the scheme and the beneficent effects that are likely to be produced.

One thing I know and that is, that this Government is moving in the right direction and has publicly professed to move towards the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society. I hope, therefore, that they will only move along the lines helpful to the establishment of those state of things which they are aiming at. I would like to urge upon them that the extraneous considerations that I have just mentioned should not now be allowed to weigh with them. Now that the country is moving towards unity and rightly towards that direction, I hope the Government will keep these things predominantly in their view.

I may just conclude by saying that I have not the least intention of casting any reflection upon the schemes that have been undertaken. Really these schemes are so beneficial, so grand and so big as to excite not only the admiration of outsiders—persons coming from outside our shores to this country—but also to enthuse our people and excite our hon. Prime Minister as he has himself said on so many occasions. I think these schemes should now be brought to a successful completion so that the beneficent effects thereof may be made to reach the people sooner than is generally expected. I hope the Government will pool their resources and make progress in those schemes as speedily as they can and keep in view, so far as the Second Five Year Plan is concerned, schemes like the Gandak River Valley Scheme about which I have just mentioned, keep the points I have mentioned in view and execute these projects as speedily as is possible, on these lines.

**Mr. Chairman:** Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that in fixing priorities for the river valley schemes to be executed in the Second Five Year Plan preference should be given to those schemes which are capable of producing quick results at cheaper cost".

**Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi):** Sir, on a point of order. There is no quorum either on this side of the House or on the Government side.

**The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das):** Sir, on a point of clarification. I want to know what the hon. Member means by 'quorum on this side of the House'?

**Mr. Chairman:** First of all let me count the Members before any sort of criticism on the question at issue is made.

There are only 31 Members in the House including myself. I am ring-

ing the bell. Now, there is quorum the hon. Member may proceed.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal):** I rise to give my general support to the Resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri Jhulan Sinha. In this country we note that every year vast areas are inundated and huge loss takes place not only of property and crops but even human lives are also lost due to heavy floods that take place in certain parts of the country. We know that such floods do not occur just once in an area, but there is a periodical visitation of floods in certain areas and there are certain other areas where floods occur almost every year although there may be some difference in the amount of loss that is caused due to such floods.

I come from a State where floods occur every year. Certain districts fall victims to such floods once in every three or four years and there are certain other areas which are victims of floods every year. I come from the district of Midnapur where there are certain parts—for instance the Ghatal Sub-Division and the Sadar Sub-Division—where vast areas are visited by huge floods every year. It is for these reasons that certain surveys have been made by the Government and certain schemes are now under the examination of the Technical Committee.

First of all I shall refer to one such scheme, the Kansawati Reservoir Scheme about which a reply has been given on the floor of the House by the hon. Deputy Minister. I would like to draw his attention in this connection, to another scheme which has been reported to be under survey in one of the letters which the hon. Minister was kind enough to address to us. That project is the Silavati scheme. I have written a letter to the hon. Deputy Minister stating that these projects are so inter related that they should be integrated and taken up simultaneously. Otherwise, although there will be a huge expenditure of about Rs. 23 crores, as has been estimated by the Government, the benefit will not be much. Although it

[Shri N. B. Chowdhury]

will go towards the protection of the 146 miles of embankment that is being maintained by the Government, it will not reduce the floods in those areas where floods are caused by floods of the other river. This point is very important. Because, if the Silavati scheme is integrated with the Kansavati scheme, the expenditure will not be high. The Silavati scheme would not be as big as the Kansavati scheme. What is envisaged in the Kansavati Reservoir scheme is to reduce the flood and thereby ensure protection to the embankments which are already built by the Government there.

[SARDAR HUKAM SINGH *in the Chair*]

I want to draw the particular attention of the Ministry in this regard to the principle of flood control. We find that in certain places in the country, there are embankments existing on one side of the river. There are no embankments or the embankments which existed have been removed so far as the other side of the river is concerned.

In such cases we find that although the people on the one side of the river get certain protection and there is no flood except in cases of very heavy floods when there are breaches in the embankments, on the other side, people suffer. This is a very peculiar phenomenon. People living on one side of the river are safe while lakhs of people living on the other side are suffering and in many cases whenever there is a heavy flood, they lose not only their cattle and their crops, but even their houses and sometimes, human lives are also involved. This attitude of protecting only one side of the river and neglecting the people living on the other side of the river should be changed altogether. Projects should be evolved in such a way as to ensure protection to the people in the flood area as a whole. With regard to this area, I am sure that if these projects are integrated and taken up together, there would be a large increase in production because these lands are very fertile and in spite of the flood we find that by cultivating these lands

after the floods, the people are getting something, if the flood is not very high. With regard to this project, I would not say much more; but I would only request the hon. Minister to look into this question, particularly when the schemes are under examination by the Government. I would urge upon him to consider the desirability of integrating these two schemes and taking them up simultaneously because there are tributaries which meet there and the loss that is taking place every year there is colossal. This can be solved by integrating the flood control projects which are under the consideration of the Government.

I would like, in this connection, to say a few words regarding the Ganga Barrage project. I need not dilate upon this because it is very well known to the hon. Minister that this is a very important scheme for the life of West Bengal. It is not only vital for Northern parts of Bengal, but it is vital for estuarian Bengal also.

4 P. M.

Regarding the other principle that has been incorporated in this Resolution that such projects should be given priority as would yield quick results and at the same time would not cost much, I have to make a few observations. It may be that there are certain projects which are not very cheap. But, they are likely to yield quick results. We cannot be very categorical about this. There are cases where they may have to spend a little more, but by spending more, they will get quick results. Quick results would be there; but the amount involved would not be small. I was speaking about one project which, according to the preliminary estimates, is likely to cost Rs. 20 crores. That has been recommended by the State Government; that has been suggested by Members of Parliament from the different parties. I think that we should take up not only the schemes which will yield quick results and at the same time be cheap; but in certain cases, we have also to consider schemes which will yield

quick results, but which may not be very cheap. When there is a certain re-orientation in the implementation of our river valley projects, particularly in the outlook towards the flood control schemes in general, much money can be saved.

Some experiment is going on in the Kosi area. We all know that certain Engineers went to China. They had gained some experience and they are going to apply their experience in India. We have to see how this new experiment makes a success. We wish that it gets success. It would certainly be cheaper. Without relying too much on this new technique that is being pursued, we can all agree in general that in this country where there is vast unemployment, and human labour, we can rely as much as possible and to the maximum extent on the human labour. We may not have to import, in that case, heavy machinery from abroad and we may save a lot of foreign exchange. That is accepted by everybody that we should try to avoid the importation of such heavy machinery, particularly where we can do with the unemployed labourers in this country. We know that this has assumed added importance in view of the conditions of the agricultural workers who remain unemployed for a major part of the year. From the Labour Ministry's enquiry regarding the conditions of agricultural labour, we find that most of them do not get work for beyond 200 days in a year. After the harvesting season, there is sufficient scope for engaging these people in building dams or other works necessary in connection with flood control projects. Unemployment among such people is so great that the wage is going down. We have read in the preliminary report submitted by the Engineers who went to China, that there the people work in these projects after the harvesting season, getting a wage of Rs. 1-4-0 to Rs. 2 a day. Along with these wages, they get certain other facilities also. I feel that taking into consideration the present level of wages in the country, if the Government of India make

some such plans to utilise the services of these workers, it would be cheaper. They would not have to import machinery from abroad. I support the general principle of this Resolution without being categorical as regards the cheapness of the projects.

In this connection, I would refer to the cases of certain other projects in West Bengal. There, for instance, certain projects are necessary for 24-Parganas in the estuary of Bengal, and there are certain other projects which would be necessary for the districts of Midnapore and Hoogly, and they would be able to show quick results if the Government take them up in this situation when we find that the people in those areas are unemployed. This year particularly, there are scarcity areas in the districts of Bankura, Midnapore and 24-Parganas. So, if these projects which are under the consideration of the Government are taken up quickly, then Government can use the services of unemployed workers in those regions, thereby providing work to these people, and at the same time starting projects which would not only yield quick results, but will increase the production in those areas to a large extent.

So, I support this Resolution.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy (Chittoor):** If you will kindly waive notice, I would like to move an amendment to this Resolution. In the peculiar circumstances in which the other two resolutions were barred, I thought you might be pleased to waive notice.

**Mr. Chairman:** But this request for the waiver of notice cannot come orally and verbally. Even now, the hon. Member has not sent any amendment to me. How can I waive notice or do anything when there is nothing before me? Then again, some other hon. Member has depended too much upon my ability to recognise his signature. He has sent me a chit without putting his name on it. Therefore, I would request the hon. Members at least to tell me who is that gentleman.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** May I just read out the amendment?

**Mr. Chairman:** That would not be sufficient.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** I have got it here.

**Mr. Chairman:** In the meanwhile I shall call upon another Member to speak.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** No, Sir. I will continue my speech.

I quite sympathise with the main purport of this Resolution. Excepting for a certain small change, I would certainly recommend this Resolution for acceptance of this House.

Obviously, no responsible Government would indulge in spending a large amount of money on projects that will not yield either quick results or be the cheapest in the circumstances. I take it for granted that every Government, whether Central or State, will, in fixing priorities, usually, normally, choose such schemes which will yield quick results at cheaper cost, unless there are certain extraordinary circumstances in which the State Government or the Central Government is compelled to choose some other scheme. There may be such occasions when they will have to choose not the cheapest scheme, but a little more costly scheme.

I might, in this connection, refer to the Kosi scheme. The Kosi scheme might not have been the cheapest or the most quick-yielding scheme. It had to be chosen for reasons which are very well known to all the Members of the House. Therefore, though Government acts in the best possible manner, it should not be directed as given out in this Resolution to choose only schemes which yield quick results without any proviso. Therefore, in order to provide that proviso, I intended to move this amendment which would read:...

**Mr. Chairman:** He need not speak upon his amendment before he has given notice. Unless that comes to me, how can I suppose it would read like that? He may continue his speech.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** The main purport of my amendment would be —after your perusal of the amendment I hope...

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, the hon. Member may continue.

**..Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgoan):** May we know the wording of amendment.

**Mr. Chairman:** First, let me read, if I can do that. This is what the amendment says:

"After the words 'preference should' the word 'usually' be added."

This is the amendment. I am afraid even without it the Member can argue his point. He need not depend upon this amendment, and also perhaps I may not be able to give that waiver which he wants.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** But any way,...

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes. The hon. Member might argue as he likes.

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** I would like to suggest that either the State Government or the Central Government should not be fettered with this word "should" which is peremptory in this context. Therefore, I would like to give a certain reserve power to the State Government and to the Central Government, by adding the word "usually". When it is added, the Resolution would read thus:

"This House is of opinion that in fixing priorities for the river valley schemes to be executed in the Second Five Year Plan preference should usually be given to those schemes which are capable of producing quick results at cheaper cost."

As I have already submitted, usually the Government will choose only such schemes which will yield quick results at cheaper cost, unless there is some other very important reason for changing such a priority. Therefore, I would recommend this Resolution to the acceptance of the House with this amendment.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum):** I oppose the Resolution.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad):**  
Oppose the Resolution?

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** She has the right to do so.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** He will presently know why I am opposing the Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Good.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** The First Five Year Plan spent crores and crores of rupees, and if you examine the places where these crores are concentrated, you will find that gross injustice is done to the South, especially to Travancore-Cochin State. That is why I oppose the Resolution.

To bring before you facts and figures, I wish to call your attention to the report of the First Five Year Plan in which the total amount spent is Rs. 265.90 crores. What percentage of it has been spent in Travancore-Cochin or anywhere in the South? They have set apart for the total rehabilitation scheme—I do not talk about it because we have that problem not very prominently in Travancore-Cochin or in the South. But on irrigation projects, they have spent for five years Rs. 77.74 crores, and how much of it in the South? On power projects for the five years up to 1953 they have spent Rs. 66.84 crores. What percentage of it have we got in the South? I wish to impress the House with the scant attention paid to the South.

Then, I wish to place before you facts regarding the extent of the area and the population to show the importance of the South and also the amount earned by Travancore-Cochin State to the Central treasury. Our State has an area of 9,144 square miles with 92,80,425 of population. In Punjab, as you know, Mr. Chairman, there is an area of 37,378 square miles with a population of...

**Mr. Chairman:** Does the hon. lady Member contend that in deciding the choice of the places where these pro-

jects are to be undertaken, any consideration is given to population etc.?

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** I am only impressing you on the need for equitable distribution of the national wealth and earning. Punjab is a very tender point, I can understand that.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. lady Member is mistaken. I come from PEPSU.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** I am very happy.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** PEPSU which is going to be merged with Punjab.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** Punjab has a population of 12,641,200, and what is the expenditure there? The Bhakra-Nangal project alone spends a sum of Rs. 5500 lakhs. The D.V.C. spends about Rs. 4600 lakhs. But how much do we get in the south? It is only an argument on facts and figures that I am putting forward. I wish to point out to you how much Travancore-Cochin State has earned by way of customs duties alone in the year 1954. According to the *Accounts of Foreign (Sea, Air, Land) Trade and Navigation in India*, by way of customs duties on Indian merchandise, Travancore-Cochin has earned about Rs. 4,104,527 in 1954. With these contributions to the Central treasury, I wish to ask the Mover of the Resolution what justification and what claim he has in bringing forward a Resolution of this nature, and suggesting the completion of those projects which produce quicker results. What objection can he have for equitably distributing the national wealth throughout the whole of India? The hon. Member spoke about completing the river valley projects. I agree with him that they should be completed, but I say, with due consideration of the needs of the rest of the States. We got from the Planning Commission only a sum of Rs. 7 lakhs in 1953-54.

**Shri Amjad Ali (Goalpara-Garo Hills):** On a point of order. In counting the Members do you also count

[Shri Amjad Ali]

the Members who are just now present in the central hall, or only those who are present here inside the chamber?

**Mr. Chairman:** Are we not having quorum now? I shall ring the bell now.

**An Hon. Member:** This is the fate when private Members' business comes up.

**Mr. Chairman:** I only see as much as the hon. Member does.

**Shri Nambiar (Mayuram):** I think the Members on the other side should help us on private Members' days.

**Mr. Chairman:** Now, there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue her speech.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** Of the Rs. 28.32 crores set apart for irrigation, tube-wells, land improvement and manure, as given in the Progress Report on the working of the First Five Year Plan, Travancore-Cochin State gets nothing, and the south gets only a very little percentage. Out of the amount set apart for the Central Tractor Organisation, Madhya Pradesh gets 30.795, Uttar Pradesh gets 35.230, Madhya Bharat gets 15.807, Bhopal gets 25.897, while Travancore-Cochin State gets nothing, and the south gets only very little.

I am not placing before the House all the facts and figures as given in the first report on the Five Year Plan. This is more or less a cursory glance only I have already placed before the House the amount earned by Travancore-Cochin State by way of customs duties in 1954. I shall now give you the figures for 1953. It comes to nearly Rs. 3,79,116,021. We earned a total by way of customs on Indian merchandise to the tune of Rs. 379,148,065

**Shri R. S. Diwan (Osmanabad):** May I know whether we are discussing equitable distribution of funds

for planning, or we are discussing this Resolution?

**Mr. Chairman:** We are discussing a Resolution in which priority and preferences are claimed for particular projects.

**Kumari Annie Mascarene:** Shortly we are going to have another Five Year Plan. If the amount set apart for the Second Five Year Plan is again going to be distributed in the north only, where they have already concentrated thousands of crores of rupees for all kinds of industries, and if again they are going to concentrate all the national wealth in the north only and we are going to starve very heavily, we mean to disintegrate from the north, and leaving them in the north, we shall have our own south Indian Republic.

**शंभूत ठाकुर दास भागंब :** अगर इस रिजोल्यूशन को मामूली तौर पर देखा जाय तो शायद ही कोई इस की मुकालिफत कर सकता है। ताहम में अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जो बातें मेरी बहिन मिस स्करीन ने फरमाई हैं, वे चाहे उस कंटेक्ट में बिल्कुल दुरुस्त न हों जिस कंटेक्ट में उन्होंने न फरमाई हैं, लेकिन मैं इस रिजोल्यूशन को एबसोल्यूट तौर पर मानने को तैयार नहीं हूं।

पहली फाइव इअर प्लान (पंचवर्षीय योजना) में जब गवर्नमेंट ने यह फैसला किया तो उस वक्त तो यह फैसला दुरुस्त था कि इस फाइव इअर प्लान में जो ज्यादा रिबर वैली स्कीम्स (नदी घाटी योजनायें) थीं और जो इरीगेशन प्रोजेक्ट्स थे वह उन लाकों के अन्दर बनाये जायें जहां पानी ज्यादा है और जहां इन को बनाने से ज्यादा फायदा हो सकता है और जहां इन को आसानी से बनाया जा सकता है। उस वक्त मुसीबत यह थी कि हमारे पास खुराक काफी



नहीं थी और खुराक की पैदावार जरूरी चीज़ थी। इस वास्ते ऐसे इलाकों की तरफ, कि जहां पर इस तरह की फैसिलिटी नहीं थी, ज्यादा ध्यान नहीं दिया गया और यह ठीक ही किया गया। उस वक्त यह जरूरी था कि जल्दी खुराक पैदा की जाय और इसलिये यह बाजिब नहीं था कि उस वक्त खराब इलाकों पर रुपया जाया किया जाता। उस वक्त खुराक की बहुत ज्यादा जरूरत थी और इसलिये यह अच्छा ही था कि जहां ज्यादा से ज्यादा खुराक पैदा हो सकती थी वहां रुपया खर्च किया जाय। चुनावे ऐसा किया गया। लेकिन अब सैकिंड फाइव इअर प्लान में भी उन्हीं इलाकों को फायदा पहुंचाना, कि जहां पानी की बहुतायत है, दुस्त नहीं है। जब हम ने कसटीट्यूशन में दफा १४ रखी थी सभी इन्तानों के वास्ते कि सब को ला का ईक्वल प्रोटेक्शन होगा, उस वक्त यह भी चाहिये था कि हम यह उसूल भी मान लेते जहां तक कि रीजन्स का सवाल है वहां भी ईक्वालिटी रखी जायगी। यह गलत है कि सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान के एक ही हिस्से में तरक्की करें। जितने पसमांदा लोग या इलाके हैं उन का हक है कि उन को दूसरे लोगों और इलाकों के दर्जे तक उठाया जाय।

मुझे इस सिलसिले में रायलसीमा की मिसाल याद आती है। रायलसीमा वालों ने कहा था कि हम बैकवर्ड एरिया वाले हैं। हमारा मद्रास से फैसला हो चुका है। उन्होंने ने कहा कि वे आन्ध्र के साथ उस वक्त तक नहीं जाना चाहते जब तक कि वह यह न कहे कि हम इतना रुपया तुम्हारे लिये खर्च करना चाहते हैं। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो बैकवर्ड इलाके हैं उन का खास तौर पर ख्याल रखा जाना चाहिये और जब स्कीमें बनाई जायं तो उन को पसेपुशत न डाल दिया जाय, पोलिटिकल कंसीडरेशन्स से या किसी और

बजह से। अगर ऐसा नहीं किया जायगा तो मैं हिन्दुस्तान के हर हिस्से में तमीज़ करने लगूंगा और मैं हिन्दुस्तान को एक नहीं कह सकूंगा। इसलिये जिन इलाकों में बैकवर्डनेस है उन की तरफ गवर्नमेंट की निगाह जाना जरूरी है।

मुझे मेरे दोस्त हाथी सिंह साहब की कटसी से एक किताब पढ़ने को मिली है जिस में प्लानिंग कमीशन के उसूल बापह तौर पर दिये गये हैं। मुझे उन को पढ़ कर निहायत खुशी हुई। उस में इन चीजों की रियायत रखी गई है। उस में यह दिया गया है कि चीप कास्ट पर काम हो। इस से कौन इन्कार कर सकता है। लेकिन उस में जो पांच चीजें दी गई हैं उन से मालूम होता है कि जो बैकवर्ड एरियाज हैं उन की तरफ पूरा ध्यान दिया जायगा। अगर ऐसा नहीं होता तो मैं शिकायत करता कि इस में रीजन वाइज़ ईक्वालिटी नहीं है। और उस हालत में कोई भी इलाका हम से जुदा होने की धमकी दे सकता था और कह सकता था कि हम तुम्हारे साथ नहीं रहना चाहते। अगर मेरे साथ इन्साफ नहीं होगा तो मैं ऐसा महसूस जरूर करूंगा। और जब मैं साउथ की तरफ से सुनता हूँ कि हम को मदद नहीं दी गई तो मैं नाराज नहीं होता बल्कि मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि यह लोग बैकवर्ड हैं, इन को पहले मदद देनी चाहिये। और मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि जो इलाके पसमांदा हैं और जहां पानी की तकलीफ है पहले उन को प्रिफरेंस देनी चाहिये।

बदकिस्मती से मेरे इलाके का एक हिस्सा सारे हिन्दुस्तान से ज्यादा बैकवर्ड है। मैं सारे जिले हिसार की शिकायत नहीं करता। मेरा वह इलाका इतना ही बैकवर्ड है जैसा कि मेरी बहिन का इलाका है।

लभापति महोदय : वह भी पानी की शिकायत करती थीं। तो भाई बहिन आपस में फैसला कर लें।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : मैं पेप्सू या हिसार की शिकायत नहीं करता क्योंकि ये इलाके तो भाकड़ा डैम से पानी हासिल करेंगे और इन में भाकड़ा डैम के पानी से आब-पाशी होगी। लेकिन मैं अपने इलाके में भिवानी की तरफ से शिकायत करता हूँ। सारे पंजाब में एक भिवानी का ऐसा इलाका है जिस की मैं शिकायत करता हूँ। वहां पर नेचर ने हमारे साथ यह सक्ती की है कि तीन तीन सौ फुट तक कुवां खोदते चले जाओ। हो सकता है कि कहीं दस फुट मीठा पानी मिल जाय, वरना खारी पानी ही मिलता है। जिस का नतीजा यह होता है कि आदमी और डंगर तबाह हो जाते हैं। उस इलाके की हालत बहुत खराब है।

इसी तरह से गुड़गांव के बारे में किदवई साहब ने मेहरबानी कर के फरमाया था कि हम तुम को दो करोड़ रुपया या तो प्लानिंग कमीशन से दिला देंगे या अपने पास से देंगे। जो आप की रिवर वैली स्कीम्स हैं उन का पानी गुड़गांव में पहुंचाया जा सकता है। वहां के लिये स्कीम बनाई जाय। लेकिन किदवई साहब की वफात की वजह से फिर वह मामला रुक गया। हमारा ऐसा इलाका है जहां से कोई मिनिस्टर नहीं बना, और तो और कोई डिप्टी कमिश्नर भी, सर शादी लाल को छोड़ कर, नहीं बना। वह लोग नौकरियों में नहीं जाते हैं और वहां के लोगों के साथ सही सलूक नहीं किया गया है। वहां पर आप की रिवर वैली प्रोजेक्ट्स का पानी आसानी से पहुंच सकता है और इस के लिये किदवई साहब ने ५०

लाख रुपया का वायदा इस साल में खर्च करने का किया था। लेकिन जब मैं ने अजित प्रसाद जी की खिदमत में अर्ज किया तो उन्होंने ने कहा कि हम तो दस लाख से ज्यादा अपनी मिनिस्ट्री से नहीं दे सकते। हम ने प्लानिंग कमीशन को दरखास्त की। पता नहीं उन्होंने ने इसे किसी स्कीम में शामिल किया है या नहीं। यहां तो यह काम फौरन होना चाहिये था। यह तो एक बैंकवर्ड एरिया है। मेरी मुसीबत को जनाब सोचें। गुड़गांव में से जमना नहर निकलती है। हमारे इलाके के बीच में से यह पानी चला जाता है लेकिन हम इस में से एक बून्द भी नहीं ले सकते। यह पानी यू० पी० चला जाता है। आप को जिला गुड़गावा में पानी ले जाने का अख्तियार है लेकिन हम उस में से एक बून्द पानी अपने यहां आबपाशी के लिये नहीं ले सकते। क्या एक मां अपने बच्चों के साथ ऐसा सलूक कर सकती है कि एक के इलाके में से पानी निकाल ले जाय और उस को एक बून्द पानी भी न दे। फिर भी आप कहते हैं कि सेक्शन १४ है। इलाकों के लिये आप का सेक्शन १४ नहीं है। गवर्नमेंट को सोचना चाहिये कि ऐसे इलाकों को पहले मदद दे। हमारा भाकड़ा डैम अब बन रहा है। अंग्रेजों के जमाने में ३३ साल तक यह स्कीम गवर्नमेंट के सामने रही और इन कंसीडरेशन्स की वजह से कि यह हिन्दुओं का इलाका है इस को पूरा नहीं किया गया। इस के बाद वाली थल स्कीम्स पूरी हो गईं लेकिन इस को पूरा नहीं किया गया। इस इलाके की तरफ किसी ने भ्राल उठा कर नहीं देखा। गवर्नर साहब आये तो उन्होंने ने कहा कि अगर इस इलाके को पानी दे दिया गया तो मवेशी कहां से आवेंगे और रिफ्रूट कहां से आवेंगे। मैं अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि अब इस तरह के कंसीडरेशन्स के दिन गुजर चुके। जो बैंकवर्ड इलाके हैं

उन के साथ आप को पूरी हमदर्दी होनी चाहिये और जल्दी से जल्दी उन को दूसरे इलाकों की बराबरी में लाना चाहिये। जो कंसटीट्यूशन की दफा पहले दफा १६ थी वह अब आप के ३०१ से ३०७ तक की आर्टिकल्स में रखी है। अगर किसी इलाके में अनाज ज्यादा हुआ हो और दूसरे में न हुआ हो तो अगर उस इलाके में अनाज बहुत महंगा मिले जहां वह पैदा नहीं होता तो मैं समझूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान एक नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान उसी वक्त एक समझा जा सकता है जबकि जो पैदावार एक हिस्से में हो वह दूसरे इलाके में उसी भाव पर बिके, हॉटस्पॉटेशन चार्जेंज और लग जायें। अगर आप इस नुकते निगाह से देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि यह जो क्विक रिजल्ट्स की दलील दी जाती है अब यह उतनी ठीक नहीं है। इस वक्त ऐसी क्विक रिजल्ट्स की जरूरत नहीं है। जिस वक्त इस की जरूरत थी तो मैं ने खुद कहा था कि इस वक्त यही उसूल रखा जाय कि जहां ज्यादा अनाज पैदा हो सकता है वहीं हम काम करें। अब हम अनाज के मामले में सेल्फ सफिशेंट हो गये हैं। इसलिये मुझे उम्मीद है कि जो इलाके पसमांदा हैं उन के साथ गवर्नमेंट इन्साफ करेगी। चाहे यह रिबर वैली स्कीमों का मामला हो या और कोई तरक्की का मामला हो हम चाहेंगे कि गवर्नमेंट सारे मुल्क को एक निगाह से देखे। जो अच्छे इलाके हैं अगर उन्हीं को आप और मदद करेंगे तो जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके हैं वह भी पीछे रह जायेंगे। इसलिये मैं अर्ज करता हूँ कि आप इन इलाकों को उसी निगाह से देखें कि जैसे मैं अपने छोटे छोटे बच्चों को देखती है। जो ज्यादा बैकवर्ड इलाके हैं जहां पीने तक को पानी नहीं मिलता है उन की तरफ आप गहरे ध्यान दें। सिर्फ रिजल्ट्स को ही देख कर आप फैसला न करें। मैं मानता हूँ कि रिजल्ट्स

भी एक चीज है। उन का भी जरूर ध्यान रखना चाहिये। लेकिन और बातों की तरफ भी आप का ध्यान होना चाहिये। सिर्फ यही नहीं देखना चाहिये कि वहां इतनी कपास पैदा हो जायगी तो उस से इतना पैसा आ जायगा। यह कंसिडरेशन किसी हद तक ठीक है लेकिन जो बैकवर्ड एरियाज हैं उन को पहले मदद दी जानी चाहिये।

इसलिये जो उसूल मेरे दोस्त ने अपने रिजोल्यूशन में रखा है मैं गो कि उस से एक्सेप्टान नहीं ले सकता लेकिन जो चीजें प्लानिंग कमीशन के कोड में दर्ज हैं मैं उन के साथ उस को पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। उन के साथ इस रिजोल्यूशन को मिला कर ही पूरी पिक्चर पेश की जा सकती है। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि क्विक रिजल्ट्स की खातिर आप बैकवर्ड इलाकों को भूल जायें। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस की एक कम्पलीट पिक्चर को देखें और तब फैसला करें तो मुनासिब होगा।

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** I do not entirely agree with the Resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend Shri Jhulan Sinha. Nor do I agree with the amendment moved by my hon. friend here, nor do I agree with Miss Annie Mascarene, the hon. Member from Travancore-Cochin, who has opposed this Resolution. I feel that there is some sense in giving priority to such schemes which are capable of producing quick results at cheaper costs. But, we cannot make a general rule that only those schemes should be taken up because, as Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava as ably pointed out, there may be backward regions in this country and priority should be given to those backward regions. There is no consideration of North, East, South or West, as has been pointed out by Miss Annie Mascarene. It may be quite true and relevant, probably, in some other place, that the South has been neglected. I shall agree with her

[Dr. Suresh Chandra]

when she says that some parts have been neglected in the South. I also come from an area which is very much neglected and which had been very much neglected by the State Government. I have often requested the Planning Minister and the Minister of Irrigation and others to look into the problems of that area which has been neglected for centuries and where there is no drinking water. In the villages, if you go deep into the interior of the Aurangabad district, which is supposed to be a tourist centre and a centre of civilisation some thousands of years ago, of which we boast so much and of which we advertise so much—in spite of all that, I regret to say that the Government have not taken any notice and there is dearth of drinking water in hundreds of villages, with the result that the Deputy Minister of Irrigation is fully aware that two years ago there was not only food famine but there was also water famine. Not only men were migrating towards other areas but even cattle were being taken away from that place. So, I wanted to emphasise that certain schemes for minor irrigation that have been put forward from that area should be given priority and preference.

There is also another point which does not concern exactly Aurangabad but which concerns the whole region in which Aurangabad is situated. If we examine the river valley schemes which are being executed or which have been executed for the last several years in Hyderabad, one is bound to find that most of these irrigation schemes are concentrated in areas where there is abundance and where people have plenty of water for irrigation and where there is plenty of food and other facilities. The region in which Aurangabad is situated is being neglected. We have been saying this in season and out of season. I would request Government to look into things in which we are interested.

There is also a scheme about the Poorna project. I have nothing to say

against taking up the Nandikonda or the Tungabhadra which is already there and which will benefit other areas of the country. But, at the same time, we must not neglect certain backward areas of the country about which Panditji has said. Because, if we neglect them, the result will be very bad for the people and for the Government. Therefore, it is high time that the Government should consider these problems very seriously and act accordingly. Otherwise, the political as well as other results would be very dangerous.

I also want to submit to the consideration of this House a point about the big river valley schemes. I feel that we should not, like our hon. friend from Travancore-Cochin, grudge if big schemes like the Bhakra-Nangal and the Damodar Valley Corporation are taken up, because they are also parts of our own country and we cannot ignore them. One cannot say that Bhakra-Nangal was a wrong step. Do we understand that millions of refugees who have left their lands and water and everything and come from that area and migrated to this place should have no land, no water and no shelter? We have been discussing these things on the Demands for the Rehabilitation Ministry. It would be very unjust and unfair, I think, to talk that there should be no Bhakra-Nangal or there should be no Damodar Valley.

As far as the Damodar Valley Corporation is concerned, I would say that we are spending Rs. 80 crores—it is a very big sum—and the original purpose of starting this project was flood control. Flood control had the first priority, then irrigation and third was power. The original estimate for the Damodar Valley Project was Rs. 40 crores and we have now spent Rs. 80 crores. The original purpose was to remove the sorrow of that Damodar river by which millions of people were affected. That was a right step taken. But, unfortunately, as the project went on, as the project proceeded, that priority was neglected

and even today, I understand, that flood control purpose will not be entirely achieved by these dams. I have myself visited that area and I can say that we have built dams....

**Dr. M. M. Das:** It is entirely wrong to say that flood control purpose will not be served.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** I have said it on some authority. I can present facts. The opinion of the experts is that after some years this purpose of flood control might not be fully served because we have based our estimates on the greatest flood which that area had some ten or fifteen years ago. The whole thing was based on that and if there is a greater flood than that in the future, we have not made sufficient provision for that. That is what I mean to say. I would advise the hon. Member from West Bengal to go and study these things and then tell me about it.

[SHRI BARMAN *in the Chair*]

**Shri S. N. Das** (Darbhanga Central): Who are the experts?

**Dr. M. M. Das:** He has got his own experts.

**Shri S. N. Das:** I want to know the names of the experts.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** You can go through the reports of the Damodar Valley Corporation where you will find it. You are a member of the Public Accounts Committee and you should, certainly, know that. (*Interruption*) Mr. Chairman, I think I have every right to say what I say and the hon. Member will also have his time.

**Shri Tushar Chatterjea** (Serampore): It is only about big projects. But there are areas where the minor projects need improvement.

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** I am not saying about big projects at all. I am saying that the purpose for which the Damodar Valley Project was started would not be fully served.

The original estimate was Rs. 40 crores and it has gone very much above that.

I was coming to irrigation when I was interrupted by the Parliamentary Secretary. I was saying that though the dams have been constructed the irrigation canals are not ready. Does the hon. Parliamentary Secretary know how much of land in the Durga Khund area is being irrigated by this dam? (*Interruptions*)

**Shri S. N. Das:** How can you expect irrigation when the barrage is still under construction?

**Dr. Suresh Chandra:** Some of the barrages are ready there. The Tilaiya dam is ready and not even a single acre has been cultivated.

There are so many interruptions that I find it difficult to proceed. I am not in the habit of interrupting hon. Members when they speak.

I agree with the principle underlying this Resolution that the criterion for starting projects in the country should be the backwardness of the area. I, therefore, feel that in formulating the Second Five Year Plan Government should take into consideration the backwardness of the area, where nothing has been done so far and where there is no drinking water. I request Government to take all these points into consideration.

**Dr. Gangadhara Siva** (Chittoor—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Coming as I do from Andhra, and particularly Rayalaseema, I would like to bring to the notice of this House that for the last several years continuously we have been suffering from acute shortage of water. That is the most unfortunate part of the country forsaken by God and forgotten by Government.

“Water, water everywhere,  
But not a drop to drink.”

says the couplet. Everywhere we see water, but nobody had taken care

[Dr. Gangadhara Siva]

to look into the affairs of Rayalaseema, until the Prime Minister came to our rescue by sending the Army to deepen our wells. Even then we were not able to get sufficient water to drink. The whole country sympathised with the poor victims and sent assistance to the poor people of Rayalaseema. But I wonder how the Central Government was so unkind as not even to care for Rayalaseema.

I have been listening to my hon. friends who have criticised the policy of Government with regard to big projects. Of course, we need these big projects. But why should you not think at all of the backward areas? In Rayalaseema, whose grievance I am voicing here, no minor irrigation works have been started under the Five Year Plan. I would request the hon. Minister to make a note of this.

**Shri S. N. Das:** Is there any river there?

**Dr. Gangadhara Siva:** Of course, there are no perennial rivers; we have to depend on the rains. But if minor irrigation works are completed, we can conserve the rain water.

Groundnuts are one of the main commercial crops of Rayalaseema. I am sorry that the Commerce and Industry Ministry are so unkind that they have stabbed our ryots in the back by driving them into poverty. I hope that hereafter at least the Central Government will take more interest in the affairs of Rayalaseema.

Sir, Andhra it was in the whole country which has opened the eyes of the whole world by the verdict they have pronounced at the recent elections on the success of the democratic and socialist pattern of society followed under the able guidance of our Prime Minister. Under these circumstances, I would request the Central Government to pay more attention to Andhra, and particularly Rayalaseema, and also to include an adequate number of minor irrigation works in the next Five Year Plan.

**Shri R. S. Diwan:** When I look to the spirit of the resolution I find that it has been specially worded for areas like Rayalaseema and Travancore-Cochin. The spirit underlying the Resolution is that cheap and small projects should be given priority and taken in hand in backward areas. Some of our friends argued that their area has been neglected, simply because some big projects have not been started there. Evidently big projects are not possible there. That is no reason why they should be considered as neglected areas.

Not only am I a sympathiser of those areas, but let me tell you and the House that I am one of the sufferers, as I come from the Marathwada area of the Hyderabad State, where there are no prospects of big projects according to the Planning Commission. Our demand is the same. We want smaller projects which could be done with lesser money and shorter time. I do not therefore see any reason why my hon. friends from Rayalaseema and Travancore-Cochin should oppose this resolution. I quite agree with them that the neglected and backward areas should receive higher priority in the matter of equitable distribution of funds from the Centre. The Planning Commission should make an equitable distribution of funds according to the necessities of those areas. Where big projects are not feasible the Central Government should take up minor irrigation projects, so that those areas may get the benefits of irrigation. If we have got smaller projects then in addition to irrigation we can change the humidity of the region; we can see that there is sub soil percolation of water for our wells. This will benefit agriculture as well as provide drinking water. We cannot bring big rivers to areas where they don't exist; it is a question of nature. But where there are small rivers, they should be harnessed for the benefit of the people.

From the trend of the discussion and especially from the arguments by

our friends from the South, I find that they have shifted the whole emphasis of the Resolution to a different direction. I would request them to understand the spirit of the Resolution. The spirit of the Resolution, according to me, is that when bigger schemes are more costly and they require more time, Government should take smaller schemes in their hands so that while the cost may be less, the achievements and the results will be speedy. Therefore, I support the Resolution and request Government to give priority to those areas which are undeveloped and backward and where there are no possibilities of big projects.

**Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur):** My hon. friend from Rayalaseema just now voiced the widespread feelings of the South. I am not in entire agreement with this Resolution. Of course, I do not attribute any motives to the Mover of the Resolution or question his intentions. The idea underlying the Resolution was all right when there was shortage of foodgrains in our country. Now that we have attained the goal of self-sufficiency we have to view the whole question from a different angle. Our country is progressing in all spheres and shining brilliantly now, like a full moon but there are some dark spots on it. I mean these are the poor and backward areas. These dark spots should be removed. If one or two of the limbs in the body are ailing it cannot be said that the body is sound and healthy. The ailment should be remedied, and the disease should be cured. I mean to say that the poor and backward areas should be improved, and those people living in the scarcity areas should be helped by all means and by all developmental schemes.

If this Resolution is accepted, what will happen? There is a feeling, a widespread feeling in the South that most of the funds of the plan were taken away by the North for all the major projects included in the Five Year Plan, leaving a scanty amount to the South. For instance, none of the big projects in the South, worth

mentioning, excepting the Tungabhadra project, has been included in the First Five Year Plan. If you refer to the Tungabhadra project, no doubt, it is a big project costing about Rs. 40 crores. When was it started? It was started during the Adviser's regime, and some work was done on that. Later on in the usual course, the execution of that work was continued and completed. Except that, what is the big project worth mentioning that has been included in the Plan? All the while, we, the people of Rayalaseema are clamouring for the high level channel of Tungabhadra but our cry has become a cry in the wilderness. I represented a number of times, made several speeches in the House, and approached the Ministers for the inclusion of the high level Channel of the Tungabhadra project in the 1 Five Year Plan. Yesterday also I said, and I am repeating it today, that it should be included in the Plan. Though the Tungabhadra project is constructed at a heavy cost, the area forty miles away from the Tunghabhadra project is not getting even a drop of water. What is the good of constructing such a project at such a heavy cost, without giving water to the people to whom it was intended. I can understand if it is a fresh one, the Government can hesitate to take it up immediately. But it is included in the plan and Estimate of the original project. Unfortunately the Government is not coming forward to execute that work for inclusion of it in the 1 Five Year Plan, for the last three years they have been contemplating. Still nothing has materialised or come out.

The impression and the inference of the people of the South is that in the name of projects for flood control, some crores have been taken away, and now under the pretext of schemes of quick results and cheaper cost the remaining funds will be taken away and nothing will be left for the backward areas, particularly for the South. In the South we have very few rivers of perennial nature. And even if we have, the work has to be



[Shri Lakshmayya]

done at a heavy cost. And I do not think they would produce quick results because the land, though fertile is uneven in the South. It would take relatively more time to be brought under the plough. Under these circumstances we will be left with no benefit of the Plan. If this resolution is accepted some more projects in North India—why some more—innumerable projects will be included in the Second Five Year Plan, to be constructed in the North, because they have a number of river valleys. It will be like over-feeding the well fed man. What is the good of it? What we want is that the hungry and the needy should be given food and they should be protected. They should be fed and clothed.

What I wish to say in the end is that the poor and backward tracts should be taken care of. They should be given all the necessary protection. All irrigation facilities should be given to the scarcity areas and famine affected tracts and the black spots that are now existing on the shining map of India should be removed. Now there is no fear of shortage of food. The poor people in the scarcity areas should be given all help and brought to the same economic level and standard as are others in the developed areas of North. Then our India, the New India which you are going to build, will grow into a prosperous state and every citizen would feel happy.

With these words I oppose the resolution.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I know how long the hon. Minister will take?

**The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi):** About twenty minutes.

**Mr. Chairman:** This discussion will go on up to 5-35 p.m. It commenced at 3-35 p.m.

5 P.M.

श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी (जिला हमीर-पुर) : सभापति जी, प्रस्तावक ने जो छोटी सिंचाई योजनाओं के पक्ष में प्रस्ताव पेश किया है, इस में कोई शक नहीं कि यह बहुत अच्छा प्रस्ताव है। जो हमारी पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना पूरी होने वाली है, उस में हमारी सरकार ने बड़े बड़े बांधों की योजना बनाई थी। इन बांधों में देश का बड़ा हित निहित है। अब जो अगली योजना बन रही है, उस में हमें इस बात का ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा कि छोटे परन्तु आवश्यक काम पहले हों। हम कहते हैं कि जो हमारी योजना बनेगी वह जनता की योजना होगी। इस के लिये बहुत सी आवश्यक बातें ऐसी हैं कि जो सरकार को ध्यान में रखनी हैं। मिसाल के लिये मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि बहुत से ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं कि जहां पर बड़ी नदियां नहीं हैं और वहां पर बड़े बांध बनाये नहीं जा सकते। ऐसी स्थिति में अगर हम बड़े बड़े बांधों की बात सोचते रहेंगे, तो जिन क्षेत्रों में कोई आबपाशी के साधन नहीं हैं तथा सिंचाई की कोई अन्य व्यवस्था नहीं है, वहां पर कोई बांध बनने ही नहीं। इसलिये जरूरी हो जाता है कि हम उन क्षेत्रों की तरफ भी ध्यान दें कि जहां पर बड़े बांध तो नहीं बनाये जा सकते लेकिन जहां पर सिंचाई के साधन हमें पैदा करना है। इन साधनों को पैदा करने के लिये एक तो छोटे छोटे बांध बनवाइये, छोटी बांधियां नालों पर बांधी जा सकती हैं। छोटे छोटे बांध बांध कर वहां पर आप सिंचाई का काम ले सकते हैं। कई राज्यों में यह काम चल रहा है लेकिन जो सब से बड़े दुःख की बात है वह यह कि हमारे राज्य में यह किया गया है कि एक एकड़ जमीन में पानी केवल १०० रुपये की लागत में भर जाएं। उत्तर प्रदेश में यह भीतर रक्खा गया है कि १००

रूपये में अगर एक एकड़ जमीन में पानी भर जाये तो वह बांध बनायेंगे, लेकिन अगर १०० रूपये से ज्यादा लगते हों, तो वह बांध नहीं बनायेंगे। अब आप को बतलाऊँ कि कुछ ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं, जैसे बुन्देलखंड, जो एक पहाड़ी तथा ऊंचा नीचा इलाका है और वहां पर सम्भव नहीं है कि सभी जगह १०० रूपये में एक एकड़ जमीन में पानी फँल जाये, इसलिये वहां जो बांध बनाने के लिये अग्रियाँ आती हैं, वे मंजूर नहीं की जाती हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना यह है कि औसतन अगर यह हो जाये कि किसी क्षेत्र में २ बीघे में १० रूपये लगते हैं और किसी जगह आधे बीघे में सौ रूपये लगते हैं, तो दोनों को जोड़ कर अगर दो सौ रूपये में दो एकड़ में पानी भरने का औसत पड़ जाता है तो ऐसी स्थिति में वहां पर बांध मंजूर करना चाहिये। किसी में औसतन कम लगे और दूसरे में ज्यादा लगे, तो दोनों को जोड़ कर औसत ठीक होने पर बांध खड़ा कर दिया जाये और ऐसा करने से जिस इलाके में ज्यादा खर्चा करना है, वहां के लोगों को भी लाभ पहुंचेगा और कम वाले इलाके को भी लाभ पहुंचेगा।

इस के अतिरिक्त मेरी शिकायत यह है कि जो नाले मौजूद हैं उन नालों की तरफ हमारा ध्यान नहीं गया है। नालों से दो नुकसान हम को होते हैं। एक तो यह कि बरसात के दिनों में मैंने अपनी कांस्टीट्यूंसी में जराखर तहसील राठ में देखा है कि ६-६ और ७-७ मील के घेरे में पानी भरा रहता है, दो तीन महीने तक पानी वहां पर भरा रहता है और बरसात निकल जाने के बाद वह पानी बिलकुल सूख जाता है, और उस पानी का कोई इस्तेमाल नहीं हो पाता है। साथ ही साथ बरसात के दिनों में तमाम ट्रैफिक रुक जाता है, न बैलगाड़ी जा सकती है न घोड़ा आ जा सकता है और किसी सवारी की बात तो जाने दीजिये,

इतने पानी में पैदल चलने में भी काफ़ी दुश्वारी पेश आती है। ऐसा एक नाला पांडुवाहक है जो अनेकों गांवों को द्वीपवत बना देता है। यह नाला इतना गहरा और तेज है कि तैर कर पार करना भी आसान नहीं। आप समझ सकते हैं कि अगर आप ऐसे नालों पर बांध बना दें तो उस का एक लाभ तो यह होगा कि उस पानी का हम इस्तेमाल कर सकेंगे और साथ ही साथ यातायात भी चलता रहेगा। एक काम तो आप को यह करना चाहिये कि जहां जहां पर ऐसे खतरनाक नाले हों, उन पर बांध बना दीजिये, और उस से आप का आब-पाशी का भी काम चलेगा और यातायात का साधन भी लोगों को उपलब्ध होगा।

मेरे क्षेत्र में दो बड़े बड़े बांध बनाये गये हैं जिन से कई लाभ हुए हैं। कबरई बांध पर सत्तरह लाख रुपया खर्च आया और जिस से ५ हजार एकड़ की आबपाशी हुई, दूसरे अर्जुन बांध बनाने पर ६५ लाख रुपया खर्च हुआ जिस से २६ हजार एकड़ जमीन की सिंचाई हुई जिस का अन्दाजा यह है कि १७ लाख का ५.५ गुना तो खर्च हुआ लेकिन सिंचाई हुई ६ गुनी। यह ठीक है कि बड़े बड़े बांध बनाने से काफ़ी क्षेत्र में सिंचाई हो सकती है। इसलिये जब छोटे बांधों के लिये मैं कहता हूँ तो उस का यह मतलब नहीं है कि बड़े बांधों की योजना बिलकुल छोड़ दी जाये, मेरा कहना तो यह है कि बड़े बांध जहां पर बनाये जा सकते हों, अवश्य बनाये जायें लेकिन इस के साथ साथ ऐसे प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये और ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये कि जहां जहां बड़े बांध बनना सम्भव नहीं है, और वहां सिंचाई की जरूरत है, ऐसे स्थानों पर छोटे छोटे बांध बनाये जाने चाहियें, अगर इस क्रिसम की योजना आप करेंगे तो मुझे विश्वास है कि आप अपने उद्देश्य में पूर्णतया सफल होंगे और

[श्री एम० एल० द्विवेदी]

आप के ऐसा करने से जनता में भी आप के प्रति विश्वास उत्पन्न होगा ।

लेकिन जो सब से बड़ी बात में आप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि कुछ इलाक़े ऐसे हैं कि जहाँ के निवासी श्रमदान देने को तैयार हैं और श्रमदान देकर वह काम करना चाहते हैं ऐसे कामों के लिये एक तिहाई रुपया या आधा रुपया आप देते हैं और बाकी वह श्रमदान से पूरा कर देते हैं । इसलिये मैं चाहूँगा कि जहाँ जनता श्रमदान करने को तैयार है और अपना योग देने को तैयार है, वहाँ सब से पहले योजना तैयार की जाये । जो लोग श्रमदान देने को तैयार न हों, उन को प्रायर्टी न दी जाये । हमारे इलाक़े जिला हमीरपुर में ३६ मील की नहरें श्रमदान से बनाई गई हैं, और भी काम हुए हैं जैसे लगभग १०० मील सड़कें, पंचायत घर, विनोबा पाठशाला, अस्पताल आदि आदि । उस के लिये सरकार से एक कौड़ी भी नहीं ली गई, सरकार कोई मदद हम को नहीं करती, यहाँ तक कि एक तिहाई की भी सहायता नहीं मिली । सरकार उस इलाक़े में मदद करती है जहाँ कि जनता श्रमदान में सहयोग नहीं दे रही है । अतएव मैं कहता हूँ कि यदि श्रमदान के काम पर आप जोर देंगे तो देश में उत्साह बढ़ेगा । असली जरूरत सरकार की मदद की वहाँ पर होती है जहाँ कि लोग श्रमदान देने को तैयार होते हैं । जहाँ जरूरत नहीं होती है वहाँ के लोग सामोरा बैठे रहते हैं । आप के जो संसद् सदस्य तथा अन्य प्रतिनिधि हैं वह अपने अपने क्षेत्रों की बात जानते हैं, आप जो योजना बनायें, उन में उन की भी राय लीजिये और विधान सभा के जो सदस्य हैं उन से भी राय लीजिये, जो अधिकारियों के स्तर (आफिशियल लेवल) पर योजनायें बनती हैं, उन में सही सही बातों का पता

नहीं चल पाता । इसलिये सरकार को चाहिये कि जो भी वह योजना बनाये उन्हें कार्यकर्ता (पब्लिक वर्कर्स) देहातों में जो काम करते हैं उन की राय ले कर बनाना चाहिये, क्योंकि ऐसा करने से आप के जो प्रोजेक्ट्स बनेंगे वह ज्यादा सरल बनेंगे, कम खर्चालि होंगे और ज्यादा लाभदायक होंगे । अगर आप मेरे सुझावों को मान लेंगे और राज्य सरकारों को इस सिलसिले में आवश्यकताकीद करेंगे तो मुझे विश्वास है कि आप की अगली पंचवर्षीय योजना सही मानने में जनता की सच्ची योजना होगी और सब लोग उस की क़द्र करेंगे ।

श्री पी० एल० बारूपाल (गंगानगर-मुम्बनु-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : हमारे बहुत से साथी पहले बोल चुके हैं । हर एक ने बताया कि हमारा एरिया बैकवर्ड है, मैं भी उन से सहमत हूँ, लेकिन राजस्थान जोकि बीरभूमि जरूर है परन्तु वह प्रदेश कितना सूखा और भूखा है यह किसी से छिपा हुआ नहीं है । मैं आप को बताऊँ कि हमारे राजस्थान प्रदेश की समस्या बड़ी अजीब है, वहाँ पर बीस, बीस मील दूरी तक पानी पीने को नहीं मिलता है सिंचाई की बात तो दूर रही, बीकानेर की तहसीलों लूनकरनसर आदि में पानी नहीं निकलता है और अगर निकलता भी है तो ३०० फुट गहरा और खारा उस को पीने से पशु भी मर जाते हैं । कई गांव ऐसी हालत में हैं । मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान उस मर भूमि की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर ऐसे बांध बांधे जायें जो सिंचाई के लिये हो तो बड़ी खुशी की बात है लेकिन कम से कम लोगों को पानी तो पीने को मिल जाये और अगर वहाँ पर पानी लोगों को सुलभ हो जाये तो वहाँ की जनता बड़ी सुखी और सन्तुष्ट हो सकती है । पानी को

वहाँ पर कितनी कमी महसूस की जाती है, इस के बारे में तो राजस्थान की हिस्ट्री में और दूसरी किताबों में भी पढ़ा होगा कि वहाँ के ग्रामीण लोग आप को पीने के लिये दूध दे सकते हैं लेकिन पानी नहीं, क्योंकि पानी को वह बचा कर रखना चाहते हैं। पानी उन को अति प्रिय है क्योंकि उस की वहाँ पर बहुत ही कमी है। पानी बड़ी मुश्किल से मिलता है। जिस को छोटे कुण्डों में वर्षा होने पर इकट्ठा करते हैं। अन्त में मैं और अधिक न कह कर यह कहना चाहूँगा कि जो जैसलमेर और बीकानेर के इलाके हैं वहाँ पर नहरें और बांध बनाये जायें जो कम से कम ग्रामीण लोगों को पीने के पानी की और खेती की सुविधा हो जाये। मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे थोड़ा सा समय अपने विचार प्रकट करने के हेतु दिया।

**Shri Hathi :** As one looks at this Resolution, *prima facie* it appears to be an ideal proposition which generally no one would like to object to. But that is only an impression which is gained at a glance. As one goes deeper into that and studies the wording of the Resolution, one rather feels hesitant to accept word for word what is contained in the Resolution. The spirit of the Resolution may be commendable but when this House accepts a resolution, the question before the House would be whether we would like to bind the House with that resolution. That is exactly what happened during the course of the debate here.

As we find from the trend of the debate, the Mover of this Resolution supported it. The very next speaker qualified it by saying that there may be cases where cheapness may not be the main consideration and he quoted the example of floods. Flood protection may not be cheaper; it may not yield the same returns as another project. He also emphasised the needs of other areas. He mentioned the other two projects. The third speaker, as

the debate proceeded, was inclined to move an amendment and thought that it would not be proper to bind the House with the Resolution and wanted the word 'usually' be added to that. As the debate progressed further, other considerations began to prevail and we had before us the consideration of regional areas, backward areas, scarcity areas, distribution of national wealth and so many other factors. Later on, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava spoke and he referred to the report of the Planning Commission and the various standards which have been laid down in determining priorities.

All this leads us to one conclusion. Even looking from the trend of the discussion in the House and the various shades of opinion as had been expressed here they go to show that as the Resolution stands, it would not be acceptable. Of course, as I mentioned at the very beginning, it *prima facie* seems to be an ideal one.

I shall now say what actually the Planning Commission has laid down in this regard. The Resolution as it stands wants that for determining priorities of the river valley schemes to be executed in the Second Five Year Plan, preference should be given to those schemes which are capable of producing quick results at cheaper cost. What is cheap? It is to be qualified. There are various factors which make a scheme cheap or make a scheme costly. There may be two schemes in the same area: one scheme may be capable of irrigating a particular acreage of land; it may be cheaper. There may be another scheme in the same State but the scheme may be situated in a scarcity area or a backward area or a needy area. It may be costly when compared to the other scheme. That is to say if the first scheme costs about Rs. 150 per acre, the other might be costing about Rs. 200 per acre but the area that has to be irrigated by the second costlier scheme may be larger enough and may also include areas sought to be irrigated by the cheaper scheme. So, if you compare the two schemes, the

[Shri Hathi]

first one which was cheaper in cost was to irrigate only a particular area, a limited area, excluding the scarcity area but by an addition of a few rupees more per acre you can cover that very area and also give benefit to a larger area as well as a scarcity area or a backward area or an area that is in need of water. Between the two, which should we choose? Shall we simply on the ground that it is cheaper exclude the other one which goes to benefit the area which is in dire need of water and irrigation? Here, hon. Members have expressed this opinion that that should not be the only standard. Cheapness by itself cannot be the sole criterion. Of course we have to take into consideration that the schemes that are included in the Plan are comparatively cheap. But the word 'cheap' has to be defined and has to be thought of from various considerations. The Resolution, as it is moved, does not at all say what cheapness means. Cheapness may not be purely in terms of money. It may be in terms of benefit to the community from other points of view also. It may be in relation to the saving of human life also. It may be in regard to other factors also. And these factors are very well enunciated in the criterion laid down by the Planning Commission in the report at page 367. I shall read, with your permission, the relevant clause which is No. 3:

"Projects which are more remunerative in direct financial returns in terms of cost of irrigation per acre or per unit of power generated and in total benefit to the community and those which would yield quick results should be given preference." This is one of the criteria laid down. It means both the things. It says quicker results must be obtained. It also says that it should be less in cost, not less in cost independently of everything else.

With regard to the total benefit which a community would derive from the scheme, that is a co-ordinat-

ed way in which we have to look at a particular scheme. And then the other standard which is laid down is at clause 5 which says:

"Region-wise requirements of food and power must receive due consideration and also the needs of backward areas".

Now, if we were to take the policy as enunciated by the Planning Commission in fixing priority, it meets almost all the arguments which have been advanced. It says that it is not only the cheapness that has to be considered, it is not only the quickness of the results that has to be considered singly but we have to take into consideration the needs of the region and the fact that a particular area is a backward area. So, on the whole, we have to take into consideration various factors and then fix priorities. It would, therefore, not be appropriate to bind this House by a resolution which, though it has a good motive behind it, might sometimes prove or offer difficulties in the way of fixing priorities.

In connection with the fixing of priorities, several Members had raised questions with regard to the individual schemes. I do not think this is an occasion where it would be proper for me to offer any remarks on any individual schemes because when a particular scheme is discussed it could be discussed in relation to the various considerations which have to be taken into account by fixing priority. Why a particular scheme was included, why a particular scheme was excluded, could all be discussed at length when we have proper time for that, but so far as the first Plan was concerned, generally we all know that there were schemes already taken up in hand. We had not sufficient data available with us and even the schemes that we started were started very often on incomplete data, incomplete investigation, with the result that we have found, and the House knows, that very often we had

to have further investigations made. Anyway, looking to the needs of the country then and having regard to the fact that certain projects were already in hand, these projects were taken in hand and included in the Plan. Now we have reached a stage when it may be possible for us to have a clear picture of the country as a whole, when we have got time to see the needs of the different parts of the country, to see how far it would be practical to have a particular scheme in a particular area, what would be the public enthusiasm in support of a particular scheme and how far the people are ready to receive the scheme.

A suggestion was made that schemes where public co-operation would be coming forward should be given priority. That is of course a suggestion which I welcome. We have in fact entered upon an experiment where if the experiment succeeds—and I am quite sure that the experiment is proving successful—we can have it elsewhere and we can have more such projects and the tempo of river valley projects in the sector of public co-operation would increase and if that is so, nothing would be difficult in this country for achieving good results in shorter periods. We have enough man-power and if the surplus man-power that is available to the country would all co-operate in contributing to the various constructions of dams, earth dams and it may be even masonry dams, it would not be difficult at all to achieve our targets in shorter periods than we are doing today. I am sure that the people would respond to this. So far as the Government is concerned, we have already, as I said, started an experiment at Kosi and we hope to make it a success.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I would like to ask of the hon. Minister one clarification. Is it his feeling that the Community Projects and the National Extension Service are going to be permanent?

**Shri Hathi:** I am sorry. I was not talking about the Community Projects. I was replying to a point raised by Shri M. L. Dwivedi.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** I have one doubt to be cleared in this connection. Where works are being completed by *Shramdhan* drives and where Government promised one-third by way of assistance, and when that too is not given to them, that becomes a difficult problem.

**Shri Hathi:** We are mixing perhaps two things. One is the question of the local development works; the other is, what I was talking about, that is, the point which the hon. Member referred to—our engineers' visit to China and people's participation in the construction of earth dams. In such works there was no question of one-third or one-half to contribute. It may be either *Shramdhan* or it may be even one of labour co-operative coming forward. It is not that we want *Shramdhan* only. People may not be in a position to give *Shramdhan*, they can mobilise to work on payment.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** In our area they are prepared.

**Shri Hathi:** It may be. People may be poor there and they may not be able to contribute anything. It does not matter. What we want is not contribution in cash or even contribution of free labour. What we want is more men, more labour to come forward. It may be village co-operative societies or labour co-operatives. They can come forward and carry on the work.

The other point was about the community projects where one-half or one-third is demanded from the people. That is a different issue altogether. I shall not touch that point. When I was talking about people's co-operation in the construction of river valley projects, I had a different idea altogether and that was about having embankments and earth

[Shri Hathi]

dams with the co-operation of the people—it may be either as *Sharm-dhan* or it may be even paid; that was the idea.

The other point that was referred to was the equitable distribution of national wealth. I was rather pained to hear the criticism that more money is being given to a particular part in the north and less money is given to the other part. The idea is to distribute wherever possible and wherever feasible. Wherever it is technically feasible we start different schemes in different parts of the country. It is not that north is to be favoured more than the south or east than the west. I do not think that is the spirit with which we should look at the projects or at any part of the country; nor would I look at Rayalaseema from the point of view whether it is in the north, south, east or west. What the Planning Commission has said is...

**Shri Lakshmayya:** Scarcity areas.

**Shri Hathi:**..... that the needs of the region, backwardness of the area and the interests of the area must be the criterion and not as to what particular part or direction of the country it comes from. We are only concerned as to whether that part is in need of irrigation; whether there is scarcity and whether the schemes are feasible. Even in scarcity areas, I say for the benefit of this House that we are not fixing any upper limit—not that it should be only Rs. 100 per acre—and in scarcity areas there are schemes for which we have sanctioned about Rs. 500 per acre or even more.

**Shri Lakshmayya:** In Rayalaseema the high level canal is feasible and so let it be included.

**Shri Hathi:** For scarcity areas schemes worth about Rs. 200 crores have been sanctioned. Various schemes in different parts of the country have been sanctioned. There, the criterion of Rs. 100, Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 per acre has not been stuck to. In fact,

that has been relaxed in several cases because it is not actually weighing in balance of the money against the water that is to be given. Where we know that the area is in dire need of water and it has to be given water for irrigation purposes—if there is potentiality of course,—the fact that it costs Rs. 200 or even Rs. 500 cannot come in the way of scarcity areas.

Regarding the other individual schemes, as I said, I am not going to reply regarding all the schemes—it may not be possible and generally it cannot be possible.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Minister has exceeded his time. So, he may finish in another two minutes.

**Shri Hathi:** I will take only one more minute. My submission is that, as we have seen from the trend of the House, it is not possible to accept the Resolution as it is. Though in spirit the Planning Commission has accepted it, there are various other considerations which also we have to take into consideration. Therefore, it is not possible for the Government to accept the Resolution. But, I hope, in view of the policy which is laid down so clearly by the Commission, the hon. Member would not press his Resolution.

**Shri Jhulan Sinha:** I am glad that the principles underlying my Resolution have been accepted by the Planning Commission and are being accepted by the hon. Minister in charge of it. But, I am pained at one thing. That is, that I have been misunderstood by several hon. Members who have spoken. I never meant to exclude any backward area or make any distinction between, north, south, east and west. What I wanted was to conserve national wealth and use it to the highest good of the country. If that principle is accepted, I feel satisfied that the purpose underlying my Resolution has been served. I would, therefore, seek the permission of the House to withdraw it.

*The Resolution was, by leave,  
withdrawn.*